UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

MΔ	HIS	MUH.	Δ λ	IM	ΔD
IVIA	\mathbf{n}	MULL	α		AD.

Plaintiff,	Case No. 1:08-cv-889
v	HON. JANET T. NEFF
KENT COUNTY FRIEND OF THE COURT,	
Defendant.	
	_/

OPINION

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed this civil action against Kent County Friend of the Court objecting to the application of his government-issued economic stimulus check to the debt he owed for child support. The case was referred to a Magistrate Judge. On October 28, 2008, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the action be dismissed upon initial screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) on grounds that the complaint failed to state a claim. The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) requires this Court to perform de novo consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. A general objection to a Magistrate Judge's report, one that fails to specify the issues of contention, does not satisfy the requirement that an objection be filed. *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995); *Howard*

Case 1:08-cv-00889-JTN-ESC ECF No. 8 filed 11/13/08 PageID.21 Page 2 of 3

v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs., 932 F.2d 505, 508-09 (6th Cir. 1991). See also W.D.

Mich. LCivR 72.3(b).

Plaintiff's objections merely reiterate the claims he made in his Complaint. Plaintiff makes

no specific objection to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation to dismiss his case. Because the

objections do not reveal any legal or factual error in the Magistrate Judge's analysis, the Court

denies the objections.

For these reasons and because this action was filed in forma pauperis, this Court also

certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this Judgment would not be taken in

good faith. See McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 610-11 (6th Cir. 1997).

Date: November 13, 2008

/s/ Janet T. Neff

JANET T. NEFF

United States District Judge

2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

MASIH MUHAMMAD,			
TM 1 1100	Case No. 1:08-cv-889		
Plaintiff, v	HON. JANET T. NEFF		
KENT COUNTY FRIEND OF THE COURT,			
Defendant/			
<u>JU</u>	<u>IDGMENT</u>		
In accordance with the Opinion enter	red this date:		
IT IS ORDERED that the object	etions (Dkt 7) are DENIED and the Report and		
Recommendation (Dkt 5) is APPROVED an	nd ADOPTED as the opinion of the Court.		
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that	the Complaint (Dkt 1) is DISMISSED pursuant to 28		
U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) for the reasons stated in	the Report and Recommendation.		
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that	the Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3)		
that an appeal of the Judgment would not be	taken in good faith.		
Date: November 13, 2008	/s/ Janet T. Neff		
	JANET T. NEFF United States District Judge		